



Tiberius and the Libraries: Public Book Collections and Library Buildings in the Early Roman Empire

Author(s): George W. Houston

Source: *Libraries & the Cultural Record*, Vol. 43, No. 3 (2008), pp. 247-269

Published by: [University of Texas Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25549495>

Accessed: 04/05/2013 15:42

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



University of Texas Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Libraries & the Cultural Record*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Tiberius and the Libraries: Public Book Collections and Library Buildings in the Early Roman Empire

George W. Houston

The principate of the emperor Tiberius was a surprisingly interesting period in Roman library history. Devoted to books and scholarship himself, Tiberius built what must have been a very large new library, but he also confirmed the Augustan principle of constructing numerous separate structures rather than one comprehensive library. He invented the position of library commissioner, to which he appointed a scholarly advisor, not an administrator. He gave texts of three Greek authors to the libraries. This implies that those works had not previously been in the collection and so gives us valuable insight into the contents of the Augustan libraries.

Modern scholars do not ordinarily regard the principate of the Roman emperor Tiberius (reigned AD14–37) as a period of any particular interest for library history. To be sure, Tiberius's own interest in literature has often been noted: his creation of a new library at the Temple of the Deified Augustus is duly registered in accounts of the great imperial libraries in Rome, and his gift to the libraries of Rome of the works of three little-known Greek writers is frequently cited as an example of Tiberius's quirky taste in literature.¹ These and other relevant bits of evidence, however, have never been exploited as a coherent body of information on the state of libraries in the early decades of the Roman Empire. The purpose of this article is to do just that—bring the information together, consider it in context, and see what can be learned from it about Roman library history in the time of Tiberius and his predecessor, Augustus.

Tiberius as a Student of Literature: Reading and Writing

Although Tiberius was occupied above all with military, political, and administrative matters both before and after his accession to the throne, he was throughout his life deeply interested in literature, intellectual

activity, books, and, we may reasonably infer, collections of books. Earlier scholars have described this characteristic of the man in detail, so a short list of the clearest items of evidence will suffice. As a student, Tiberius received extensive training in language and literature (both Greek and Latin), history, philosophy, rhetoric, and law.² In 20 BC, at the age of twenty, he was sent briefly to Armenia on a diplomatic mission. He took with him not only political advisors but also a group of young literary men.³ On his way back to Italy he made a point of stopping briefly on the island of Rhodes, probably to study with Theodorus of Gadara, a celebrated scholar, rhetorician, and historian.⁴

After many years of public service, Tiberius in 6 BC famously abandoned his ambitions and responsibilities and retired to Rhodes, where for more than seven years, until he returned to Rome as co-regent, he led (we are told) a quiet and presumably scholarly life.⁵ Certainly, Rhodes was an intellectual center. The great scholar Posidonius had made the island the most important school of Stoicism early in the first century BC Pompey, Caesar, Cicero, Brutus, and many other young Romans had all gone there to study, and the island was an active center of astronomical studies, a particular interest of Tiberius.⁶

We know, too, that Tiberius was active as a writer. There were speeches, of course, both in various public contexts—in the Senate, in the courts, and in response to foreign emissaries—and to his troops on campaign. He wrote Greek and Latin poetry, including Greek epigrams and a poetic lament on the death of his stepson Lucius Caesar in AD 2, and toward the end of his life he wrote a short autobiography.⁷ Many of these works were published and survived at least until early in the second century, for the biographer of the emperors, Suetonius, consulted them at that time. Tiberius was, in short, a man trained and active in literature and in scholarly matters like so many men of his class and time. It will not be surprising if the evidence shows that he was concerned with collections of books in Rome and elsewhere.

The Imperial Book Collections

When Augustus died in August of AD 14, there were three public libraries in the city of Rome.⁸ The oldest was the library in the Atrium Libertatis, created by Gaius Asinius Pollio and opened no later than early in the year 28 BC. Nearly coeval was the library at the Temple of Apollo on the Palatine Hill, established by the emperor Augustus and opened, it seems, somewhat later than Pollio's library. The third, established by Augustus's sister Octavia, by Augustus, or by both of them, was located

in or at the Portico of Octavia and probably opened in the late 20s or early 10s BC⁹ We can reasonably assume that Augustus, Tiberius, and other members of the imperial family possessed substantial personal collections of manuscripts, some of them in Rome and others in villas outside of Rome, in addition to these three public libraries. Many wealthy men of the late republic had had such collections, establishing a pattern that Tiberius surely would have followed. That libraries were common in the houses and villas of the wealthy is indicated by the architectural writer Vitruvius, writing probably in the 20s BC, for he regarded it as a given that a large villa ordinarily would have had a library.¹⁰

For the imperial household there is explicit evidence for a library at the imperial villa at Antium on the coast some thirty miles south of Rome. The slaves and freedmen who worked at that villa were organized into an association and elected officers each year, and fragmentary lists of the officers, which were recorded in stone, survive. In the years from AD 37 to 48, several of the officers were men assigned to work in the library, and since the surviving inscriptions are fragmentary, it is very likely that the library had been in existence for some time before the year 37.¹¹ By analogy with this villa and given the literary interests of Tiberius, we also may infer the existence of a substantial collection of bookrolls in one or more of the imperial villas on Capri, where Tiberius spent much (but by no means all) of his time in his last years, and probably a library in the villa at Misenum, where Tiberius died in March of AD 37.¹² No doubt many other imperial residences, both within and outside of Rome, had libraries as well, just as Cicero kept book collections in at least three different residences and perhaps more.¹³

Books must have come to the imperial family and especially to the emperor in large numbers and in many ways. Authors no doubt regularly offered presentation copies of their new works to the reigning *princeps* in hopes of winning his favor and perhaps his patronage. This would be true especially when they had dedicated the work to the emperor, as Vitruvius dedicated his ten books on architecture to Augustus and Valerius Maximus his nine books of memorable deeds and sayings to Tiberius.¹⁴ Emperors received many gifts, both privately and on state occasions, and although books are not explicitly mentioned, works of art are, and at least some books were clearly viewed as valuable commodities and so might have made suitable gifts.¹⁵ Tiberius received numerous legacies and inheritances as well, and some of these, especially those involving whole villas, are likely to have included collections of manuscripts.¹⁶ Finally, of course, emperors could, like anyone else, buy or commission copies of works.¹⁷ It is hard to imagine Tiberius not acquiring a considerable

collection of Greek texts during the seven years he spent on the island of Rhodes and bringing them back to Italy.

So far as can be learned, Augustus never established an administrative system to manage all of this large and scattered collection of manuscripts. Instead, he limited himself to dealing with the libraries separately, both when he first organized a library and later when it was fully operational. Thus, Gaius Melissus, a freedman of Augustus's advisor Maecenas, organized the Octavian library, and Pompeius Macer (otherwise unknown, but probably freeborn) set up the Apollo library. As for established libraries, one man is known to have served as director of one (but not all) of them: Gaius Iulius Hyginus, a freedman of Augustus and a scholar, was director of the Apollo library, although it is not known when or for how long he served.¹⁸

The only other evidence on library administration under Augustus is indirect. In one of his poems Ovid imagines one of his books of poetry, written in exile, returning to Rome and seeking entrance into the three existing libraries. The dramatic date is roughly AD 10. First the book approaches the Apollo library, then the Octavian, and finally the library in the Atrium Libertatis. In each case the book is refused entrance by someone in charge of that library.¹⁹ What is of interest here is that there seems to be no one person for Ovid's book to approach, no single commissioner of all the libraries. Instead, there is an individual directing or in charge of each separate library.²⁰ Poetry, of course, is not the best place to look for precise information on administrative history, but still there is nothing here to suggest that there was at this time a single commissioner of all the libraries similar to the *procurator bibliothecarum* known in later times.

The Library in the New Temple of the Deified Augustus

Toward the end of his life, in the 30s AD, Tiberius built a great temple to his deified father, Augustus.²¹ In association with it he created a library, the first new library building since the Octavian library had opened some fifty years before.²² No trace of either temple or library has yet been found, and their location and plans remain uncertain.²³ The most likely location, however, seems to be in the valley between the Capitoline and Palatine hills, and we might well imagine that the Temple of Augustus itself stood within or opened onto a large open space, that the space was surrounded by a columned portico, and that the library stood outside of the portico and opened onto it.²⁴ The construction of the temple complex and presumably of the library as well was nearly or fully complete at the time of Tiberius's death, but Tiberius chose not to dedicate it

(no doubt because he did not want to enter Rome), and it was, accordingly, dedicated by his successor, Caligula, in August of AD 37.²⁵

Only two ancient sources mention this library. Writing in the 70s AD, Pliny the Elder noted that “we [can] see the Tuscan Apollo in the library of the Temple of Augustus. It is fifty feet high measuring from the toe, and I could not tell you whether it is more remarkable for the quality of the bronze or for its beauty.”²⁶ Some forty or fifty years after Pliny, Suetonius, in his biography of Tiberius, reported a dream of Tiberius: “On his last birthday, [Tiberius] had seen [in a vision] the Apollo Temenites, outstanding both in its size and in its beauty, which he had brought from Syracuse to be set up in the library of the New Temple.”²⁷

Scholars certainly might wish for more information—some reference, say, to the books, the staff, or the plan of the building. Still, we can draw some useful inferences even from these brief statements. The statue is of great interest. Colossal statues placed on low podia facing the main entrance seem to have been a common feature of large libraries, at least in later times, but this Apollo was unusually tall for such statues.²⁸ It was fifty feet high, not counting the podium on which it stood (Pliny specifies that the measurement begins with the statue’s foot), so that it would have required a roof reaching, at its peak, at least sixty feet and almost certainly more in height. For comparison, the interior walls of the splendid library of Celsus in Ephesus were some forty-five to fifty feet high, so that a sloping roof there would have reached just about sixty feet at its highest.²⁹ In Rome the interior elevation of the west library in the Forum of Trajan (part of the famous “Ulpian Library”) must be reconstructed from fragments, but it seems to have been roughly fifty feet high, with, again, the peak of the roof reaching some sixty to seventy feet.³⁰ Tiberius’s library at the Temple of Augustus, then, was approximately the equal of and possibly larger than two of the largest known libraries.

Moving the colossal bronze statue must have been difficult and expensive. As it happens, we know from Cicero that the corrupt governor Verres had tried to steal this very statue of Apollo in the 70s BC but had not succeeded.³¹ Clearly, moving it was not an easy task, and both the implied size of the library building and the expense involved in transporting the statue provide clear evidence of Tiberius’s interest in and commitment to this library. It was a project that was important to him.

Apollo, as a god interested in music, poetry, medicine, and philosophy, was obviously appropriate for a library, but his presence in the library also emphasized the connection with Augustus, since Apollo was Augustus’s patron deity.³² Tiberius may have intended this

temple-and-library complex to be a kind of mirror image of the temple and library Augustus had built on the Palatine. There the temple honored Apollo; here Apollo presided over the library. There the library was established by Augustus; here Augustus was worshiped in the temple. We know, too, that Tiberius placed one of Augustus's favorite paintings—a portrait of the mythical youth Hyacinthus that Augustus had brought back from Alexandria in Egypt—in the Temple (though not the library) of the Deified Augustus.³³ Given this, it seems entirely possible that Tiberius also gave some or all of Augustus's bookrolls, which he must have inherited, to this library. That, of course, must remain simply a hypothesis, given the nature of the evidence.

Tiberius Iulius Pappus, Commissioner of Libraries

Another indication of Tiberius's deep interest in the imperial book collections comes from the sepulchral inscription of Tiberius Iulius Pappus, a freeborn Roman citizen from the Greek East. The stone was found on the Via Praenestina east of Rome.³⁴ The Latin text appears on the left, with a line-by-line translation on the right. In the Latin, material within parentheses represents expansions of the abbreviations on the stone.

D(is) M(anibus)	[Sacred] to the Shades.
Ti(berio) Iulio Zoili f(ilio)	For Tiberius Iulius Pappus, son of Zoilus
Fab(ia tribu) Pappo, comit(i)	of the Fabian tribe, advisor
Ti(beri) Caesaris Aug(usti)	of Tiberius Caesar Augustus,
5 idemq(ue) supr(a) bybliotheclas omnes	and also in charge of all the libraries
Augustorum ab	of the emperors from
Ti(berio) Caesare usque ad	Tiberius Caesar until
Ti(berium) Claudium Caesarem	Tiberius Claudius Caesar.
10 per Ti(berium) Iulium	[Erected by] Tiberius Iulius
Niconem hered(em)	Nico, heir
in parte quarta et Iuliam	of one-fourth part, and by
Fortun(atam)	Iulia Fortunata.

In lines 5 to 9 we find that Pappus was in charge of all the libraries in Rome for a period of uncertain duration, but certainly extending from at least March of AD 37, when Tiberius died, through January of AD 41, when Claudius ascended to the throne. Given Pappus's friendship

with Tiberius (discussed below), it is reasonable to assume that he had taken charge of the libraries some (and perhaps many) years before AD 37. Pappus certainly continued in his library post after the dedication of the library at the Temple of Augustus, so his area of responsibility under Caligula and Claudius must have included at least the four great imperial collections in Rome (the libraries in the Atrium Libertatis, at the Temple of Apollo, in the Portico of Octavia, and at the Temple of Augustus), but we cannot tell how much further his responsibilities may have extended. Probably, he was expected to manage the personal collections of Tiberius and perhaps those of Claudius and other members of the imperial family. It cannot be determined whether the libraries in the imperial villas outside of Rome were also part of his sphere of activity.³⁵

Also not known for sure is whether Pappus was the first man to be given charge of all the libraries, but there is a good chance he was. It is all but certain that Augustus never appointed any such director. No other commissioner of all libraries is attested under Tiberius,³⁶ and the long and cumbersome title given Pappus in his inscription suggests an ad hoc title for a newly created position.³⁷ At this point, the question becomes a more general one: What does all this mean? What can be learned about library history from Pappus, his position as commissioner of libraries, and the possibility that he was the first such commissioner?

First, it can be noted that Pappus was very probably, although not quite certainly, the son or perhaps the grandson of a certain Gaius Julius Zoilos of Aphrodisias in Asia Minor.³⁸ Zoilos had been a freedman and agent of Octavian circa 40 BC and had apparently acquired considerable wealth as a result. If Pappus was his son, then Pappus, too, was probably a native of Aphrodisias, and he would fit comfortably within the substantial group of men from the Greek East who came to Rome in the first century BC to work in various capacities, including working in libraries for private citizens (so Tyrannio for Cicero) or, later, the emperors (e.g., Hyginus for Augustus).³⁹ Pappus may have been educated partly in Aphrodisias and partly in Rome, and if his father, Zoilos, maintained his friendship with Octavian, that could help to explain how Pappus met Tiberius and found a place within Tiberius's circle.⁴⁰

However it came to pass, Pappus certainly did find a place in Tiberius's circle. Lines 3 and 4 of his tombstone reveal that Pappus was *comes* of Tiberius. While the term *comes* was regularly used to designate those men of senatorial or equestrian rank who were *amici principis* (i.e., members of the emperor's formal body of advisors, or *consilium*) and who, as *amici*, accompanied the emperor while he traveled abroad, Silvio Panciera

argued convincingly in his discussion of Pappus's inscription that the word *comes* here has a less formal meaning, that of a friend who served as an intellectual companion and informal counselor of the emperor. Pappus, that is, was a figure something like the philosopher and astrologer Thrasyllus, also from the East and also a close advisor of Tiberius.⁴¹

It is important to note that Pappus held no administrative positions other than his library post. He was not a career administrator, in contrast to the *procuratores bibliothecarum* known from later times, men like Suetonius the biographer, Iulius Vestinus, and Volusius Maecianus.⁴² Rather, as *comes* of Tiberius and, it seems, an educated man from the Greek East, he was apparently a scholar, comfortable with and among books. He would have been a good man to sort through newly acquired texts, to work on what we would call collection development, and to choose and organize the books for the new library at the Temple of Augustus.⁴³ It would be for those reasons more than for any administrative abilities he might have had that Tiberius would have chosen Pappus to supervise the imperial manuscript collections.⁴⁴

If we put all of this together, Pappus emerges as a transitional figure in Roman library administration. In the late republic Cicero had retained Tyrannio, a scholar from the Greek East, for specific tasks and specific periods of time.⁴⁵ Augustus, like Cicero, used men who had been trained in the Greek East to organize the Octavian library and direct the Apollo library, and he had Pompeius Macer carry out the specific but limited task of organizing the Apollo library.⁴⁶ With Pappus we have for the first time a man who is given a broader set of responsibilities: he was asked not simply to organize a library at its inception (though he may well have done that for the library at the Temple of Augustus) but also to supervise libraries over a period of time; he served not just long enough to accomplish a specific single task but for at least four years and probably a good deal longer; and he was to oversee not just one library but, as his inscription proudly notes, *all* of them. In this he prefigured the *procuratores bibliothecarum* of the second century, but, unlike them, he was not a career administrator. Tiberius, in short, drew on the existing tradition of employing scholars to manage the imperial collections of manuscripts but set a precedent by assigning a single scholar the task of overseeing the *entire* imperial collection. At that time this collection was stored in at least four different structures (the four libraries known to us), but Pappus may also have been responsible for the personal collections belonging to the emperor and members of the imperial family.

Euphorion, Rhianus, and Parthenius

In his *Life of Tiberius*, Suetonius wrote about Tiberius's particular interests in literature: "He [Tiberius] also composed Greek poems in imitation of Euphorion, Rhianus, and Parthenius. He was so completely charmed by those poets that he dedicated their works, and also portraits of them, in the public libraries, among those of the old and best writers."⁴⁷ The passage is instructive in various ways. It shows that the works of Euphorion, Rhianus, and Parthenius were available in at least some of the imperial libraries from the time of Tiberius on. That is a welcome bit of information, since very little is known about the specific authors or works contained in these libraries. Also, this is one of the few instances in which a source gives the names of specific authors honored by portrait busts in libraries.⁴⁸ What makes the passage particularly valuable, however, becomes clear only when it is turned around: the crucial point is that many or all of the works of Euphorion, Rhianus, and Parthenius were *not* in Rome's imperial collections—that is, the collections established by Asinius Pollio and by Augustus—until Tiberius put them there. What does this mean? Were these writers so little known that no Roman ever would have heard of them or wanted to read them?⁴⁹

Parthenius was born in Bithynia (at that time an independent kingdom) in the early years of the first century BC. He seems to have been captured and enslaved in the 70s or 60s BC, brought to Italy, and then set free.⁵⁰ Once he was free it appears that he supported himself by teaching, lecturing, and other scholarly activities.⁵¹ More importantly, he was a significant figure in the literary scene in Italy during the middle of the first century BC.⁵² He was himself a poet, admired especially as a writer of elegiac verse. There are references to a number of poems on mythological subjects, others that were songs of lament (including one on the death of his wife), and a variety of other works.⁵³ In general, he seems to have enjoyed a good reputation as a poet; his poems, for example, were associated with those of Callimachus by a certain Pollianus, writing in the first or second century AD, and Parthenius was still being read at least as late as the fourth century AD.⁵⁴ Of his works, nothing survives beyond some fragments of his poems and a series of prose summaries of love stories drawn from Greek myths. The latter, entitled *Erotica Pathemata*, was dedicated to the Roman elegist and general Cornelius Gallus. Gallus, suggested Parthenius in his prefatory remarks, might find some use for these stories in his poetry.⁵⁵

Thus, Parthenius knew Cornelius Gallus (not necessarily very well) and may have assisted him in his writing. From Macrobius and

Aulus Gellius we learn that he also worked with and perhaps taught Vergil.⁵⁶ It is also all but certain that Parthenius knew Catullus's friend Cinna, since Cinna's work seems to have been influenced by Parthenius. It would thus not be at all surprising if Parthenius knew Catullus, too.⁵⁷ In sum, Parthenius knew in person at least a few (and perhaps many) of the most important poets of the generation that immediately preceded the first appearance of public libraries in Rome, he was himself a productive writer, and he continued to be read and reasonably well known for at least four centuries.

The Roman poets who were alive in Parthenius's day did not know Euphorion in person, for he had lived in the third century BC, but several of them were familiar with Euphorion's work. A scholar-poet, Euphorion served as director of the great library at Antioch, drew his poetic aesthetics from Callimachus, and composed several different types of poetry, mostly (so far as we know) in hexameters but perhaps elegiacs as well.⁵⁸ He is known to have written poems on mythological subjects, curse-poems, poems of praise and of lament, and several others of uncertain content.⁵⁹

Vergil seems to have been particularly familiar with the work of Euphorion, for scholars have noted verbal echoes of Euphorion in Vergil's *Eclogues* and *Georgics*, and several details in book 2 (the story of the fall of Troy) and other books of the *Aeneid* seem to be drawn from Euphorion.⁶⁰ Fragments of Euphorion preserved in papyri show that Cornelius Gallus almost certainly and Catullus possibly drew from his work. Cicero clearly knew about Euphorion, for he twice refers specifically to him and his work, in one instance characterizing it as hard to figure out.⁶¹ Papyrus fragments reveal that Euphorion retained a certain popularity and continued to be read, at least in Roman Egypt, well into the Roman Empire. From the town of Oxyrhynchus, for example, eight papyri containing fragments of Euphorion have been published to date. That is not a large number in absolute terms, but it gives us a rough idea of Euphorion's popularity in comparison to other authors known from papyri: at Oxyrhynchus, 128 authors are represented in papyri, and of them Euphorion is tied with the famous Athenian orator Aeschines for twenty-fourth most frequently attested author.⁶² We also have what appear to be the partial remains of a personal library assembled over the course of several decades in the second century AD. The authors represented in this small collection are in general the great standard authors of the past. Homer and Hesiod, the three great tragedians, the three great writers of Old Comedy, and Callimachus are all present, and we can safely infer that this was a conventional and traditional collection.

It is, then, significant that Euphorion is included. By the owners of this collection, at least, he was considered one of the authors one wanted in a solid basic collection of the Greek classics.⁶³

Of the three authors Tiberius so admired, Rhianus is probably the least familiar to modern readers. Born on Crete and active, it seems, in the third century BC, Rhianus was a scholar and poet.⁶⁴ As a scholar he produced a moderately important edition of Homer (forty-five of his readings are cited by later scholiasts and so are known to us), and as a poet he wrote both epic poems (differing in this from Parthenius and Euphorion) and epigrams.⁶⁵ The epics survive only in short fragments, but Rhianus wrote at least half a dozen of them, and they could be long. An epic *Thessalica* (Thessalian history or legends or both), for example, ran to sixteen books, and another epic, perhaps on Heracles, was fourteen books long.⁶⁶ It is not known how many epigrams Rhianus wrote, but at least ten poems, totaling fifty-five lines, were chosen by Meleager—active circa 100 BC—for inclusion in his *Garland*, a collection of what he considered to be the best epigrams written down to his day.⁶⁷ As far as we can determine, Rhianus was not well known in first-century BC Italy. Vergil seems to have been familiar with at least some of Rhianus's work, and there is a slight possibility that Tibullus was, too, but otherwise we have no specific evidence of Rhianus's influence or presence in Italy before Tiberius.⁶⁸ Still, Rhianus was a prolific writer and a respected scholar. Greek readers had high regard for his epic history of Messenia, and in Meleager's selection of epigrams Rhianus is represented by more lines of poetry than forty-nine of the sixty-five epigrammatists whose works are included.⁶⁹ That gives at least a rough idea of where Rhianus rated in Meleager's estimation.

Much more could be (and has been) said about these three writers, but the essential picture should be clear. They are certainly not writers of the very highest rank. There is no Homer here, no Hesiod or Callimachus. On the other hand, at least some of the works of all three writers were available and known in Italy during the early Augustan period, precisely when Asinius and Augustus were establishing the first public libraries. Parthenius had lived and worked in Italy in the late republic, and a number of the writers of the time knew him personally. They read what he wrote, and through him their acquaintance with the works of Euphorion and Callimachus may have grown stronger and deeper.⁷⁰ The poetry of Euphorion was known to a wide readership both in the Augustan period and later, and a number of poets read and evidently admired his work, since reflections of it can be traced in their own poetry. Rhianus was a different sort of poet, more inclined to epic

and longish poems on historical themes, so he was less likely to be of interest to the Roman elegists, but he produced a large body of work, at least some of which was available in Italy, and his continuing popularity later indicates that he was a significant author.

It comes, then, as something of a surprise that the works of these writers—or at least substantial parts of their works—were not to be found in the Augustan-era libraries and had to be supplied by Tiberius. This has implications of considerable importance for library history. To put it bluntly, there were serious gaps in the imperial collection of Greek literature. If the works of these three writers were missing or present only in part, what of writers who were less well known or less highly esteemed, such as the ninety-three attested at Oxyrhynchus in fewer papyri than Euphorion or the forty-nine epigrammatists less prized than Rhianus? And, perhaps even more important, what of the lesser works of the great masters? Could we expect to find in the Apollo library, for example, all of the 120 or so tragedies that Sophocles had written? Would we find just a few, perhaps the most famous or the best-known ones? Or would the collection of Sophocles' plays be a random sample, whatever happened to be available when the library was being assembled? Such works by lesser authors or the lesser works of the great masters might be in a given library, but, then again, they might not. You would not know until you went looking.

We cannot know for sure why there were such gaps. In the case of Parthenius, Euphorion, and Rhianus we can rule out censorship on moral or political grounds, since Tiberius later included them, and he is not likely to have diverged from Augustan policy in such a matter.⁷¹ There is, though, one possible explanation that should at least be considered. It may well be that the core collection of manuscripts in each of the great public libraries had originally been assembled by one or more private individuals. Many of the manuscripts in the Atrium Libertatis library might, for example, have been Asinius Pollio's own. Similarly, the principal collection in the Octavian library may well have consisted of Octavia's own bookrolls, for she was much interested in literature, and it is likely that she had inherited the library of Mark Antony.⁷² If these early libraries were stocked in this way, with core collections coming from preexisting personal collections, then they would presumably include representative collections of the greatest works of Greek and Latin literature plus works that reflected the former owner's particular interests.⁷³ And if it happened that neither Asinius nor Mark Antony nor Octavia, for example, was interested in Parthenius, then that author would not be represented in the Atrium Libertatis or Octavian library.

Clearly there were and continued to be significant gaps. Authors such as Parthenius, Euphorion, and Rhianus could and did slip through the cracks. The great Augustan libraries, for all their splendor, do not seem to have regarded it as part of their mission to provide a complete collection of Greek literature.⁷⁴

Conclusions

Thus far I have been using what is known from sources, or is nearly certain, in an attempt to shed light on what is not at all certain, and in so doing I have generally been moving backward in time from Tiberius to Augustus. I will now reverse this and construct a brief chronologically arranged narrative of the probable course of library history from 28 BC to AD 37.

Julius Caesar, according to Suetonius, envisioned a single great library that would contain the most complete possible collections of Greek and Latin texts, and toward the end of his life he entrusted the gathering of the texts and the organization of this library to the great scholar Terentius Varro.⁷⁵ This vision, however, was never realized, for Caesar was murdered before any such library could be established. Asinius Pollio and Augustus either rejected or ignored Caesar's conception and instead organized separate, smaller libraries on the model of the personal aristocratic collections of the late republic. The books for the new public collections may well have come from personal libraries that were established or already existing in the 40s to 20s BC. The resulting public collections were not comprehensive, and we can infer that it was not considered important for the libraries of the Augustan era to provide comprehensive coverage of Greek literature. Augustus also did not follow Julius Caesar's plan for a single scholar as director of the libraries. Instead, he seems to have been content to appoint a scholar to organize each library and then to choose a man, perhaps a scholar or perhaps simply a steward from his domestic staff, to oversee the operation of each library.

Theoretically, Tiberius could have reversed course and returned to Caesar's idea of a single great collection under a single director. In the matter of library structures and collections, though, Tiberius chose to follow Augustan procedures, not Caesar's vision. Rather than consolidate all of the manuscripts within a single structure, he created a fourth separate library, the library at the Temple of Augustus, which opened in August of AD 37, five months after Tiberius's death. At roughly the same time—the 30s AD—he appointed Tiberius Julius Pappus to take charge of all the emperors' libraries, in this respect departing from Augustan

practice.⁷⁶ It is a reasonable inference that Pappus assisted in planning and organizing the library at the Temple of Augustus, just as Pompeius Macer and Gaius Melissus had once organized libraries for Augustus, but that was not Pappus's only task: he then continued, through the principate of Caligula and into that of Claudius, to act as commissioner of all the libraries. So far as can be determined, he was the first such commissioner.⁷⁷ At an unknown date Tiberius also made sure that all of the libraries of Rome had copies of the works of Parthenius, Euphorion, and Rhianus. We cannot know if that action had any connection with the creation of the new library at the Temple of Augustus or with the appointment of Pappus.

The principate of Tiberius thus emerges as both transitional and formative in the history of Roman libraries. Tiberius continued and thus confirmed the practice of creating separate library buildings, but he also created a new position. Not only did he create the position, he chose as its first incumbent a scholar rather than a career administrator, and in so doing he defined and established its essential character; the man in charge of the libraries thereafter was always a scholar, and only much later were men appointed to this position who were career administrators as well as serious scholars. In these two actions Tiberius established principles for the administration of imperial libraries that all subsequent emperors could, and many did, follow.

Notes

My thanks to T. Keith Dix and Nicola Terrenato for discussing a number of different matters with me and to the anonymous referees for *Libraries & the Cultural Record* for helpful references. All translations of ancient texts are my own.

1. I will return to each of these topics and consider the evidence for them in the course of this article.

2. Barbara Levick, *Tiberius the Politician*, rev. ed. (London: Routledge, 1999), 16; Peter E. Knox, "The Poet and the Second Prince: Ovid in the Age of Tiberius," *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 49 (2004): 9–10; F. R. D. Goodyear, "Tiberius and Gaius: Their Influence and Views on Literature," in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, vol. 2, *Principat*, pt. 32.1, *Sprache und Literatur (Literatur der julisch-claudischen und der flavischen Zeit)*, ed. Wolfgang Haase (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1984), 603–6. All three give summaries of Tiberius's literary interests.

3. J. C. Tarver, *Tiberius the Tyrant* (New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1902), 154–63. The literary men were not very distinguished, then or later (Knox, "The Poet and the Second Prince," 9–10).

4. Levick, *Tiberius the Politician*, 17; Rossella Granatelli, *Apollodori Pergameni ac Theodori Gadarei testimonia et fragmenta (accedunt Apollodoreorum ac Theodoreorum testimonia et fragmenta)* (Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 1991), vi–vii.

5. Suetonius, *Tiberius* 11.1.

6. I. G. Kidd, "Posidonius," in *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 3rd ed., ed. Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 1231–33; Hendrik van Gelder, *Geschichte der alten Rhodier* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1900; reprint, Aalen: Scientia, 1979), 166–67, cf. 416, and for Tiberius's interest in astronomy see 418–20; and Jarrett A. Lobell, "The Antikythera Mechanism," *Archaeology* (March–April 2007): 44.

7. Martin Schanz and Carl Hosius, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur, bis zum Gesetzgebungswork des Kaisers Justinian*, vol. 2, *Die römische Literatur in der Zeit der Monarchie bis auf Hadrian*, 4th ed. (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1935), 421; Suetonius *Tiberius* 61.1.

8. I use the term "public libraries" cautiously, since it carries implications for moderns that it did not for the ancient Romans. For a full discussion of this see T. Keith Dix and George W. Houston, "Public Libraries in the City of Rome from the Augustan Age to the Time of Diocletian," *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome. Antiquité* 118, no. 2 (2006): 671–73. Here I note that during this period "books" were always papyrus rolls and libraries were rooms, often highly decorated, with shelves on which the rolls were laid for storage. "Public" means that the collections of rolls were, at least in theory, open to the public, but it does not necessarily carry any implication about the source of the book collection or ongoing funding.

9. See Dix and Houston, "Public Libraries," 673–88; also F. Coarelli, "Bibliotheca Asinii Pollio," in *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*, vol. 1, A–C, ed. Eva Margareta Steinby (Rome: Quasar, 1993), 196; P. Gros, "Apollo Palatinus," in Steinby, *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*, 1:55–56; and A. Viscogliosi, "Porticus Octaviae," in *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*, vol. 4, P–S, ed. Eva Margareta Steinby (Rome: Quasar, 1999), 141. The Octavian library was certainly put into service after the Apollo library and so after 28 BC but before the death of Octavia in 11 BC.

10. Horst Blanck, *Das Buch in der Antike* (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1992), 152–57; T. K. Dix, "The Library of Lucullus," *Athenaeum* 88, fasc. 2 (2000): 441–64; Vitruvius, *De architectura* 6.4.

11. The men were given the title *a bybliotheca*, or "staff member active in the library." For the lists see Attilio Degrassi, *Inscriptiones Italiae*, vol. 13, *Fasti et Elogia*, fasc. 2, *Fasti Anni Numani et Iuliani* (Rome: Istituto Poligrafico dello Stato, 1963), 203, 205, 207.

12. For the possibility of libraries on Capri see George W. Houston, "Tiberius on Capri," *Greece and Rome* 32, no. 2 (October 1985): 189–90. Other imperial villas of the time are listed in Gérard Bouvier, *Esclaves et affranchis impériaux sous le Haut-empire romain: Rôle politique et administratif* (Naples: Jovene, 1970), 77, and in Fergus Millar, *The Emperor in the Roman World (31 BC–AD337)* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977), 24–28.

13. T. Keith Dix, "Private and Public Libraries at Rome in the First Century BC: A Preliminary Study in the History of Roman Libraries," Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan, 1986, 108–10.

14. Vitruvius, *De architectura* 1, preface; Valerius Maximus, *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* 1, preface. For other authors who dedicated works to or praised Tiberius see J. L. Lightfoot, *Parthenius of Nicaea: The Poetical Fragments and the [Erotika Pathemata]* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), 80.

15. For gifts to emperors in general and gifts of art in particular see Millar, *Emperor*, 139–53. Important collections of books, of course, had been treated as booty in war during the republic. Examples include the books of King Perseus of Macedon (Plutarch, *Life of Aemilius Paullus* 28.6; Polybius, *Histories* 18.35.4–5) and those captured in the sack of Asculum (Plutarch, *Life of Pompey* 4.1). We also hear of a man who had an iron chest in which he kept “money or papyrus rolls” (Appian, *Civil Wars* 4.44); clearly, his papyrus manuscripts were of considerable value.

16. Millar, *Emperor*, 153–56; Boulvert, *Esclaves et affranchis*, 76.

17. Individual texts could be purchased ready-made or commissioned or prepared by one’s slaves from, say, a borrowed text. For a useful discussion of this mix of possible sources see William A. Johnson, *Bookrolls and Scribes in Oxyrhynchus* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004), 157–60. See also, for the evolution over time of a specific personal library (in this case in Roman Egypt), George W. Houston, “Grenfell, Hunt, Breccia, and the Book Collections of Oxyrhynchus,” *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 47 (2007): 352–53.

18. On Macer see Peter White, “‘Pompeius Macer’ and Ovid,” *Classical Quarterly* 42, no. 1 (1992): 210–18. See also George W. Houston, “The Slave and Freedman Personnel of Public Libraries in Ancient Rome,” *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 132 (2002): 162.

19. Ovid *Tristia* 3.1.59–68, 69–70, and 71–72.

20. It is not clear what title this man had. Ovid, *Tristia* 3.1.67–68 refers to the person in charge of the Apollo library as a *custos e sedibus illis praepositus*, or “keeper put in charge of that place.” *Custos* is not likely to have been a title applied to a scholarly director, since it generally means a physical guard or custodian. Perhaps *praepositus* was used, for not only does Ovid use the term here, but Suetonius, *De grammaticis* 20, in describing Iulius Hyginus’s directorship of the Apollo library, also says of him, *praefuit Palatinae bibliothecae*, “he was in charge of the Palatine library.” It is also possible, however, that the men who controlled access to the collections were simply *vilici*, “overseers,” drawn from the ranks of the imperial freedmen; see further below, n. 44. We do not hear of the term *procurator* in connection with libraries in the early empire.

21. The temple had been decreed by the Senate soon after Augustus’s death in AD 14, but Tiberius delayed building it for many years. M. Torelli, “Augustus, divus, templum (novum); aedes,” in Steinby, *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*, 1:145, suggests that the delay was due to Tiberius’s discomfort with the imperial cult.

22. We hear, in the second century AD, of a public collection in the Domus Tiberiana, or “residence of Tiberius,” on the Palatine Hill. This should not be taken as a library that was built by Tiberius. The very name Domus Tiberiana probably did not come into use until the major new building programs under the Flavians, when it would have become necessary to distinguish the older (Tiberian) structures from the newer (Flavian) ones. Clemens Krause, “Palatium e Domus Tiberiana,” in *Domus Tiberiana: Nuove Ricerche—Studi di Restauro*, ed. Reto Locher and Brigitte Sigel (Rome: L’Erma di Bretschneider, 1985), 133–35, discusses the evidence. Under Tiberius there seem to have been several houses on the Palatine belonging to the imperial family, with some connections between them, and we may well assume that one or more of these houses had rooms set aside for the storage of manuscripts. It is possible that some of those manuscripts made their way into Tiberius’s library at the Temple of Augustus, and it

is possible that some of them remained on the Palatine, eventually entering the collection that we know as the Domus Tiberiana library. There is no positive evidence for the existence of any book collection in the imperial residence(s) on the Palatine during the principates of Augustus and Tiberius, but surely the imperial family had one or more book collections. See also Dix and Houston, "Public Libraries in the City of Rome," 690–91.

23. The location of the Temple of Augustus, and hence of the library, has been much discussed. On the temple see the discussions by Giuseppe Lugli, "Aedes Caesarum in Palatio e Templum novum Divi Augusti," *Bullettino della Commissione Archeologica Comunale di Roma* 69 (1941): 29–58; and Mario Torelli, "Bibliotheca templi divi Augusti," in Steinby, *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*, 1:197. For our purposes, the exact location is not as important as the very existence of the library and its connection to Augustus.

24. Roughly similar plans appear elsewhere in large urban complexes. At the Portico of Octavia, for example, two temples stood within an open space that was surrounded by a portico, and in the Forum of Augustus (which had no library) the great Temple of Mars stood at one end of the open space, with a portico once again surrounding the space. Exactly where the libraries in such complexes might have been—whether they stood outside the portico or somewhere within the square—remains unknown.

25. Cassius Dio, *Roman History* 57.10.2, 59.7.1.

26. Pliny the Elder, *Historia Naturalis* 34.43: "videmus certe Tuscanicum Apollinem in bibliotheca templi Augusti quinquaginta pedum a pollice, dubium aere mirabiliorem an pulchritudine."

27. Suetonius, *Tiberius* 74: "Supremo natali suo Apollinem Temenitem et amplitudinis et artis eximiae, advectum Syracusis ut in bibliotheca Templi Novi poneretur, viderat." "Temenites" in Suetonius means simply that the statue had been "within the sanctuary," that is, the sanctuary of Apollo in the Greek city of Syracuse. Even though Pliny refers to the statue as "Etruscan" (*Tuscanicus*), it must have been Greek. Perhaps Pliny made a mistake; perhaps he simply thought of the statue as archaic in style. The two writers are surely referring to the same statue, since they both remark on the size of the statue and the high quality of the bronze from which it was made.

28. Thus, for example, the Domitianic rebuilding of the Apollo library certainly, and the Augustan version of it probably, had large niches (*aediculae*) for statues. We can see the same feature in the second-century library of Celsus at Ephesus and the third-century library in Timgad. For the details and earlier bibliography see Blanck, *Das Buch*, 193 (Apollo), 206–7 (Ephesus), 211–12 (Timgad), and 213 (his summary statement on this architectural feature). It should be noted that we cannot be sure that the Augustan-era libraries had such niches, since the Apollo library may have been redesigned under Domitian. In that case, Tiberius's library may have been the first in Rome with such a statue placed on axis.

29. This would have been high enough, archaeologists believe, for three levels of bookcases, if three were wanted. The walls of the library of Celsus survive, however, only to a height of about ten meters, and the third level of niches for bookcases is a hypothesis that cannot be proven. The estimate of the original height of the walls—about sixteen meters—is from Rudolf Heberdey, "Vorläufiger Bericht über die Grabungen in Ephesus 1904," *Jahreshefte der österreichischen archäologischen Instituts in Wien* 8 (1905): Beiblatt 62.

30. The figure for the height of the walls of the Trajan library comes from James E. Packer, *The Forum of Trajan in Rome: A Study of the Monuments* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), 121. He assumes a concrete vaulted roof rather than one of timber beams and roof tiles, but the maximum height would be about the same in either case. Compare the similar figure, also based upon a reconstruction, in Gioia Piazzesi, "Gli edifici: Ipotesi ricostruttive," *Archeologia Classica* 41 (1989): 181, fig. 76. Packer, *Forum of Trajan*, 121, 450, discusses the *aediculae* for colossal statues in the Trajan library and suggests the statues were of Minerva and Trajan.

31. Cicero, *In Verrem* 2.4.119.

32. Paul Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, trans. Alan Shapiro (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1988), 85–89.

33. Pliny the Elder, *Historia Naturalis* 35.131.

34. Full publication and discussion in Silvio Panciera, "Miscellanea Epigrafica IV," *Epigraphica* 31, fasc. 1–4 (January–December 1969): 104–20.

35. Lorne Bruce, "The *Procurator Bibliothecarum* at Rome," *Journal of Library History* 18, no. 2 (Spring 1983): 150, was inclined to think that Pappus was in charge of all the books in the imperial collections in Rome but was less sure about the libraries in imperial villas.

36. Lorne Bruce listed three men as library directors before Pappus, but we now know that none of those three was director of all the libraries (*ibid.*, 146–47). See White, "Pompeius Macer," 214–15, followed by Houston, "Slave and Freedman Personnel," 142–43, 162–63. José A. Rodríguez Valcárcel, "*Procurator Bibliothecae Augusti*: Los bibliotecarios del emperador en los inicios de las bibliotecas públicas en Roma," *Anales de Documentación* 7 (2004): 235, took Tiberius Claudius Scirtus, an imperial freedman and *proc(urator) bybl(iothecarum)* or *bybl(iothecae)*, as the first director of all the libraries, but that is very unlikely. Scirtus must have been a freedman of Claudius, not Tiberius, whose freedmen were Tiberii Iulii (rather than Tiberii Claudii, like Scirtus), and he appears to have become procurator during the principate of Claudius, not under Tiberius. There is perhaps one possibility worth considering: it is very likely that Scirtus was set free by Claudius before he became emperor (H. Chantraine, *Freigelassene und Sklaven im Dienst der römischen Kaiser: Studien zu ihrer Nomenklatur* [Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1967], 39 n. 87), and it is possible that Claudius recommended Scirtus to Tiberius as a man suitable to administer the libraries. More likely, however, Scirtus was still working as a librarian in the villa at Antium at the time of Tiberius's death and so cannot have preceded Pappus as director of all the libraries. See Houston, "Slave and Freedman Personnel," 144–45 with notes f and g.

37. Although Tiberius was not an important innovator in the imperial administration, there is at least one other instance of his putting a single man in charge of what had earlier been separate offices, and that is his concentrating the accounts of the various provinces under a single man, the *a rationibus*. On this see Boulvert, *Esclaves et affranchis*, 77.

38. For Zoilos see Joyce Reynolds, *Aphrodisias and Rome* (London: Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies, 1982), 156–64, and R. R. R. Smith, *The Monument of C. Julius Zoilos* (Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern, 1993), 4–13. Reynolds was "not quite convinced" that Zoilos was the father of Pappus (*Aphrodisias and Rome*, 164), but the coincidence of rare names and the coherence of

Pappus's career if we take him as Zoilos's son are powerful arguments in favor of the identification. Smith has no such doubts.

39. Cicero, *Epistulae ad Atticum* 4.4a.1; Suetonius, *De grammaticis* 20.

40. We do not know when either Zoilos or Pappus was born. If Pappus was the son of Zoilos, he might have been born in the 30s or perhaps the 20s BC. That would make him slightly younger than Tiberius (born in 42) and some sixty years old when he was made commissioner of libraries. It is possible that Zoilos had a son, also named Zoilos, and that it was his son, perhaps born between 10 BC and AD 10, who was the commissioner of libraries. The former scenario may seem more likely if only because it helps explain the friendship of Tiberius and Pappus.

41. On the *amici* in the *consilium* of the emperor, the definition of *comites*, and the relation between *amici* and *comites* see John A. Crook, *Consilium Principis: Imperial Councils and Counsellors from Augustus to Diocletian* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955), 24–25. A summary account of Thrasyllos's life and work is in Marie-Luise Lakmann, "Thrasyllos [2]," in *Die neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike*, ed. Hubert Cancik and Helmuth Schneider, vol. 12, pt. 1 (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 2002), 496–97.

42. For these men see Houston, "Slave and Freedman Personnel," 160–67, or Bruce, "The *Procurator Bibliothecarum*," 147–48, 151–53.

43. We cannot, of course, prove that Pappus had a part in the planning for the new library, but the fact that he was commissioner of libraries at the very time that the library was completed and dedicated certainly suggests that he had some role in planning it.

44. Much of the day-to-day administration of the libraries was probably in the hands of imperial freedmen known to us from inscriptions as *vilici*, or, roughly, "overseers." They worked with slaves (owned by the emperors or by the people of Rome) and other freedmen to carry out the physical work in the libraries, including fetching manuscripts from storage for users and then reshelfing them. See Houston, "Slave and Freedman Personnel," 155–56, 159–60.

45. Dix, "Private and Public Libraries," 136–37. Tyrannio was provided with slave assistants owned by Cicero's friend Atticus (135–36).

46. Houston, "Slave and Freedman Personnel," 142, no. 2 (Melissus organized the Octavian library), 142, no. 1 (Hyginus directed the Apollo library), and 162, no. 27 (Macer).

47. Suetonius, *Tiberius* 70.2: "Fecit et Graeca poemata imitatus Euphorionem et Rhianum et Parthenium, quibus poetis admodum delectatus, scripta omnium et imagines publicis bibliothecis inter veteres et praecipuos auctores dedicavit." Suetonius goes on to describe, among other things, the delight Tiberius took in the trivia of Greek mythology. A. F. Stewart, "To Entertain an Emperor: Sperlonga, Laokoon and Tiberius at the Dinner-Table," *Journal of Roman Studies* 67 (1977): 84–86, provides a very useful discussion of the whole passage, placing it within the broader context of Tiberius's aesthetic tastes generally.

48. By *imagines* Suetonius presumably means *imagines clipeatae*, or portrait busts in high relief, set within circular, garlandlike frames. We hear of *imagines* of Germanicus, Tiberius's adoptive son, placed on the walls of the libraries "above the column capitals," so that it is clear that busts, not full-length statues and not sculpture in the round, are what is meant by this term. See James H. Oliver and Robert E. A. Palmer, "Text of the *Tabula Hebana*," *American Journal of Philology* 75, no. 3 (1954): 227, 1.3, for the Latin text.

49. Granted, Suetonius's statement cannot be taken as proof that none of the works of these authors was in any of the imperial libraries, for it may be that Tiberius was simply filling out what had previously been partial collections of their works. But the statement surely implies that very little and possibly none of the work of these authors was to be found in the Augustan libraries before Tiberius took action. Elaine Fantham, *Roman Literary Culture from Cicero to Apuleius* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996), 286 n. 26, noted that Suetonius's comment indicates that these writers had not been included in the Augustan collections, but she did not explore the implications of their omission.

50. For details, evidence, and a discussion of the many uncertainties regarding Parthenius's life see Christopher Francese, *Parthenius of Nicaea and Roman Poetry* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2001), 17–46; or Lightfoot, *Parthenius of Nicaea*, 9–16.

51. Fantham, *Roman Literary Culture*, 28. Francese, *Parthenius of Nicaea*, 38–43, suggests various additional ways scholars might have assisted poets. They could have helped them by carrying out research, helping them read and understand difficult texts, or working with them on matters of style and language. They might also have helped them organize and manage their book collections, as Tyrannio did Cicero (*Epistulae ad Atticum* 4.4a.1).

52. There has been considerable scholarly discussion about the precise nature and extent of Parthenius's impact on Roman literature. The seminal article was that of Wendell Clausen, "Callimachus and Latin Poetry," *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 5 (Autumn 1964): 181–96, arguing, among other things, that it was through Parthenius that the young Roman poets of the 50s and 40s BC, including Cinna and Cornelius Gallus, came to know and appreciate Callimachus and Euphorion. Lightfoot, *Parthenius of Nicaea*, 50–76, was dubious about Parthenius's direct influence on the Roman poets, but see, e.g., Francese, *Parthenius of Nicaea*, 47–67, and his review of Lightfoot in the *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, April 14, 2000, accessed November 29, 2007 <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/bmcr/2000/2000-04-14.html>.

53. Parthenius's works are listed and discussed by Lightfoot, *Parthenius of Nicaea*, 31–41, and more summarily by Francese, *Parthenius of Nicaea*, 48.

54. *Greek Anthology*, 11.130. A convenient text of the *Greek Anthology* is available in the Loeb Classical Library series: *The Greek Anthology* with an English Translation by W. R. Paton, 5 vols. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, and London: William Heinemann, 1916–18); the relevant epigram of Pollianus is in 4:133, with the Greek text facing. For Pollianus's dates see Lightfoot, *Parthenius of Nicaea*, 54, and for Parthenius in the later empire see 76–96. Lightfoot notes that in some late lists of the canon of greatest Greek elegists, Parthenius replaced Philitas.

55. All the surviving poetic fragments and what survives of the *Erotica Pathemata* are gathered in the edition by Lightfoot. The stories tend to be obscure ones about unlucky lovers and loves, and ten of the thirty-six surviving stories deal with incestuous love. For Gallus and his relation to Parthenius see Fantham, *Roman Literary Culture*, 40, 56–60.

56. Macrobius, *Saturnalia* 5.17.18: "Vergil had Parthenius as his instructor (*grammaticus*) in Greek." This probably means that Vergil studied the style and meaning of Greek poetry with Parthenius. Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* 9.9.3, 13.27 says that Vergil drew material from Parthenius and gives an example of such borrowing.

57. Clausen, "Callimachus," 188–91, argued that Cinna was deeply and directly

influenced by Parthenius's poetry and that Parthenius very probably played an important role in helping Cinna and other poets come to understand and appreciate Callimachus. So also Fantham, *Roman Literary Culture*, 40. See also Robert R. Dyer, "Where Did Parthenius Teach Vergil?" *Vergilius* 42 (1996): 21 with n. 29. There is no specific evidence of a personal connection between Parthenius and Catullus (on this see 21 nn. 30, 31).

58. B. A. van Groningen, *Euphorion* (Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1977) published the fragments and, on pages 249–50, provided a brief biography. (On van Groningen's edition, however, note the cautionary review by Hugh Lloyd-Jones, *Classical Review* 29, no. 1 [1979]: 14–17.) Euphorion modeled himself on Callimachus in preferring shorter poems to epics and in his style, which is straightforward in terms of syntax but reveals a preference for unusual words and learned references. For details on his style and meter see Enrico Magnelli, *Studi su Euforione* (Rome: Quasar, 2002), 22–56.

59. Euphorion's known works are listed and sorted by type in Magnelli, *Studi su Euforione*, 93–94.

60. Adelmo Barigazzi, s.v. "Euforione," in *Enciclopedia Virgiliana*, vol. 2 (Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1985), 421–22, assembles the evidence for Vergil's use of Euphorion.

61. Cicero, *Tusculanae Disputationes* 3.45 and *De divinatione* 2.132, both written in the years 45–44 BC In the latter passage Cicero says that Euphorion is *nimirum*, "excessively obscure." He seems to be speaking from experience.

62. Julian Krüger, *Oxyrhynchos in der Kaiserzeit: Studien zur Topographie und Literaturrezeption* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1990), 214. The papyri date from the first three centuries AD Obviously, these figures give only a very approximate idea of an author's relative popularity, since there are thousands of unpublished papyri, and those could change the numbers and relative rankings considerably. But clearly, Euphorion was known and read for many centuries.

63. Houston, "The Book Collections of Oxyrhynchus," 347–50.

64. Pausanias, *Description of Greece* 4.1.6. On Rhianus's dates, which can be known only approximately, see Carla Castelli, "Riano di Creta: Ipotesi cronologiche e biografiche," *Istituto Lombardo, Accademia di Scienze e Lettere, Classe di Lettere e Scienze Morali e Storiche, Rendiconti* 128, fasc. 1 (1994): 73–87.

65. A convenient list of Rhianus's works is provided by Joachim Latacz, "Rhianos," in *Die neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike*, ed. Hubert Cancik and Helmuth Schneider, vol. 10 (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 2001), 990–91.

66. Some seventy fragments of Rhianus's epic poetry are known, although many of them are single words. The basic collection is in John U. Powell, *Collectanea Alexandrina: Reliquiae minores Poetarum Graecorum Aetatis Ptolemaicae* 323–146 A.C. *Epicorum, Elegiacorum, Lyricorum, Ethicorum* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925), 9–21. Since Powell's day several fragments have been found in papyri. Most are listed in Luigi Leurini, "Osservazioni, vecchie e nuove, su Rhian. fr. 1 Powell," in *Poesia e religione in Grecia: Studi in onore di G. Aurelio Privitera*, ed. Maria Cannatà Fera and Simonetta Grandolini, vol. 2 (Naples: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, 2000), 385 n. 1.

67. The ten surviving epigrams of Rhianus are in A. S. F. Gow and D. L. Page, *The Greek Anthology: The Hellenistic Epigrams*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965). The fragments themselves are in 1:174–76, with commentary in 2:503.

68. A. S. Hollis, "Octavian in the Fourth Georgic," *Classical Quarterly* 46, no. 1 (1996): 305–8, argues that at *Georgics* 4.560–62 Vergil imitated lines from a poem (title unknown) of Rhianus. He discusses Rhianus in the first century and the possibility of echoes in Tibullus (307 with n. 12, referring to earlier work by Francis Cairns).

69. For the importance of Rhianus's *Messeniaka* see Latacz, "Rhianos," 990, and Cristina Corbetta, "A proposito di due frammenti di Riano," *Aegyptus* 58, fasc. 1–2 (January–December 1978): 137–50.

70. Both Clausen, "Callimachus," 192, and Barigazzi, "Euforione," 162, took Parthenius as helping the Roman poets come to understand Euphorion.

71. We do know that Augustus was willing to exclude works on various grounds. We learn from Suetonius, *Julius* 56.7 that he instructed Pompeius Macer not to put what Julius Caesar had written when he was young in the new public collection on the Palatine, and, as we have seen, the poems Ovid wrote from exile were excluded from all three Augustan libraries. For a more detailed discussion of this topic see Nicholas Horsfall, "Empty Shelves on the Palatine?" *Greece and Rome* 40, no. 1 (April 1993): 60–61.

72. For the library in the Atrium Libertatis see Dix and Houston, "Public Libraries in the City of Rome," 675–80. In the case of the Octavian library, Antony may in turn have acquired through confiscation some of the personal collection of the great scholar Varro (686–87).

73. It would seem likely in any case that the early public libraries had extensive collections of the classic works of the past, and that assumption is supported by what we know of their contents. Suetonius, *Tiberius* 70.2 n. 47 states that Tiberius placed the works of Parthenius and the others "among those of the oldest and best writers." Horace, *Epistulae* 1.3.15–20 is more oblique: the poet Celsus is advised to be creative and not simply to copy the (great) works of the past that were already in the Apollo library. In passing, we may note that, if it is true that the public libraries incorporated preexisting private collections, then there was probably considerable duplication from one library to the next and perhaps within each of the public libraries, because most aristocratic libraries would have had complete copies of Homer, for example, and we would thus find numerous Homers in the imperial collection once the private libraries were absorbed into the public ones.

74. It may well be, of course, that the scholars who organized the libraries and those who subsequently directed them attempted to fill some of the gaps in their collections through purchase, commission, and in-house copying. But obviously they did not fill all the gaps, since authors of the importance of our three continued to be missing or incomplete into the reign of Tiberius.

75. Suetonius, *Julius* 44.2. As has often been noted, Caesar's model was no doubt that of the library at Alexandria.

76. At first sight it may seem odd that Tiberius would be concerned about the libraries of Rome—concerned enough to devise a new administrative position and create a large new library—in the 30s, precisely the years when he was avoiding Rome. But by no means did his administration stop simply because he himself did not enter the city, and it may well have been in the 30s, when he was traveling around Campania, with its rich collections of manuscripts, that he was particularly interested in and had the time for literature. That involvement and his discussions with the scholars at court may have been the catalyst for his actions in Rome.

77. The experimental nature of this new position is revealed when we consider what happened after Tiberius. Under Claudius, the commissioner was not freeborn like Pappus but an imperial freedman, Tiberius Claudius Scirtus; late in the first century AD it was a free Greek scholar from Alexandria, Dionysius; and only from about the time of Trajan did the position become firmly established as one to be held by Romans who combined scholarly interests with administrative skills. For details and discussion of Scirtus, Dionysius, and the later commissioners see Bruce, "Procurator Bibliothecarum," 147–53, and Houston, "Slave and Freedman Personnel," 160–72.